

\$80,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD  
OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses", \$23,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION AND  
IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" for acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of vessels, aircraft, and equipment, \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS  
STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "State and Local Programs", \$227,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount shall be for port security grants pursuant to the purposes of 46 United States Code 70107 (a) through (h), which shall be awarded based on risk and threat notwithstanding subsection (a), for eligible costs as defined in subsections (b) (2)-(4): *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND  
OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations" for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, \$132,000,000, to remain available until expended for the purchase and deployment of ration portal monitors for United States seaports: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING  
CENTER

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS,  
AND RELATED EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses," for construction of the language training facility referenced in the Mater Plan and information technology infrastructure improvements, \$18,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) de-

scribes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution \* \* \* [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule \* \* \* When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 794, by the yeas and nays;  
H. Res. 804, by the yeas and nays;  
H. Res. 608, by the yeas and nays;  
H. Con. Res. 338, by the yeas and nays; ordering the previous question on H. Res. 857, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Con. Res. 408 will resume tomorrow.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The other votes in this series will be 5-minute votes.

RECOGNIZING THE 17TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE IN  
TIANANMEN SQUARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 794, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 794, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 1, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

YEAS—362

|               |              |               |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie   | Bilirakis    | Brown-Waite,  |
| Aderholt      | Bishop (GA)  | Ginny         |
| Akin          | Bishop (NY)  | Burgess       |
| Alexander     | Blackburn    | Burton (IN)   |
| Allen         | Blumenauer   | Butterfield   |
| Andrews       | Boehert      | Buyer         |
| Baca          | Boehner      | Camp (MI)     |
| Baker         | Bonilla      | Campbell (CA) |
| Baldwin       | Bonner       | Cannon        |
| Barrett (SC)  | Bono         | Cantor        |
| Barrow        | Boozman      | Capito        |
| Bartlett (MD) | Boren        | Capps         |
| Bass          | Boswell      | Cardin        |
| Bean          | Boucher      | Carnahan      |
| Beauprez      | Boustany     | Carson        |
| Becerra       | Boyd         | Carter        |
| Berman        | Bradley (NH) | Castle        |
| Berry         | Brady (TX)   | Chandler      |
| Biggert       | Brown (SC)   | Chocola       |